

Application No. 09/589,881
Amendment dated November 4, 2009
Reply to Office Action of July 14, 2009

Docket No.: 3430-0105P

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Two sheets of Replacement Drawings (FIGS. 3, 4A, 4B and 5) are attached to this Reply.

REMARKS

This paper is supplemental to the Reply filed on October 14, 2009. The entire contents thereof are hereby incorporated herein.

Status of the Claims

Independent claims 1, 2, 6-11, 14-18, 21 and 24 are pending in the present application and claims 1, 10, 11 and 21 are independent. No amendments to the claims. The specification and drawings have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Drawing Objection

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for allegedly failing to show every feature of the claims, specifically, the feature that “wherein a size of the plurality of convex portions increases with increasing distance from the light source.” Applicant respectfully traverses this objection.

In the filed Reply dated October 14, 2009, Applicant argued that *one of ordinary skill in the art can properly discern the meaning of “wherein a size of the plurality of convex portions increases with increasing distance from the light source” by reference to the illustration in Fig. 4 and the disclosure on page 6 of the specification discussed above, and without the separate illustration thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the requirement for an illustration of “wherein a size of the plurality of convex portions increases with increasing distance from the light source” is respectfully submitted to be unnecessary.*

Nevertheless, in an effort to advance prosecution only, Applicant attaches hereto Fig. 4B for illustrating the above limitation. Fig. 4B is supported by at least Fig. 4A and page 6, lines 11-12 of the present specification. Also, the relevant descriptions are added at page 6 without adding new matter.

Accordingly, the requirement for an illustration of "wherein a size of the plurality of convex portions increases with increasing distance from the light source" is respectfully satisfied, and reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In view of the above and the previously filed Reply of October 14, 2009, Applicant believes the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Kyung Sook Chang, Reg. No. 56,946, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Esther H. Chong
Registration No.: 40,953
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

Attachment: Replacement sheets of Figs. 3, 4A, 4B and 5